



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,169	02/26/2002	Petri Hyypa	NOKI14-00021	5147
30973	7590	09/07/2005	EXAMINER	
SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P.			IQBAL, KHAWAR	
5956 SHERRY LANE				
SUITE 1400				
DALLAS, TX 75225			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2686	

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/083,169

Applicant(s)

HYPPA ET AL.

Examiner

Khawar Iqbal

Art Unit

2686

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-6,8-16,20-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable by Shaganti et al (20050065950).

3. Regarding claim 1 Shaganti et al teaches a method of accomplishing a transaction by user equipment, the method comprising (figs. 1-3):

in response to a predetermined event, automatically inserting of transaction information in at least one data field of an information entity associated with the transaction based on information available at the user equipment (para. # 0051, 0055, 0009, 0040-0043,0048, figs. 2a, 3); and transmitting the information entity from the user equipment over a wireless interface (para. # 0009, 0040-0043, 0051, 0055, figs. 2a, 3).

Regarding claim 2 Shaganti et al teaches comprising step of authorizing said insertion of transaction information (para. # 0009, 0040-0043,0048, figs. 2a, 3).

Regarding claim 3 Shaganti et al teaches wherein the authorization is based on unique identity code associated with the user equipment (para. # 0009, 0040-0043, 0048, figs. 2a, 3).

Regarding claim 4 Shaganti et al teaches wherein the authorization is based on one of the following means: personal identity number (PIN); Subscriber Identity Module (SIM); Number Assignment Module (NAM); Wireless Application Protocol (WAP) Identity Module (WIM); a unique product code of the user equipment; an international mobile subscriber identity (IMSI) code (para. # 0009, 0023, 0040-0043, 0048, figs. 2a, 3).

Regarding claim 5 Shaganti et al teaches wherein the authorisation is accomplished at the user equipment (para. # 0009, 0040-0043, 0048, figs. 1, 2a, 3).

Regarding claim 6 Shaganti et al teaches wherein the authorisation is accomplished by a service provider (para. # 0009, 0040-0043, 0048, figs. 2a, 3).

Regarding claim 8 Shaganti et al teaches wherein the event comprises reception of the information entity (para. # 0009, 0040-0043, 0048, figs. 2a, 3).

Regarding claim 9 Shaganti et al teaches wherein at least part of the transaction information to be inserted in the information entity is obtained from a storage means provided at the user equipment (para. # 0009, 0040-0043, 0048, 0055, figs. 2a, 3).

Regarding claim 10 Shaganti et al teaches wherein at least part of the transaction information to be inserted in the information entity is obtained from another information entity available for the user equipment (para. # 0009, 0040-0043, 0048, 0055, figs. 2a, 3).

Regarding claim 11 Shaganti et al teaches wherein the user gives a confirmation before said step of inserting information in the information entity (para. # 0009, 0040-0043, 0048, 0055).

Art Unit: 2686

Regarding claim 12 Shaganti et al teaches wherein the information is inserted by transaction processing means of the user equipment (para. # 0009, 0040-0043, 0048,0055, figs. 2a, 3).

Regarding claim 13 Shaganti et al teaches wherein the user equipment inserts information in a data field of the information entity in a predefined manner (para. # 0009, 0040-0043, 0048,0055, figs. 2a, 3).

Regarding claim 14 Shaganti et al teaches wherein the information entity is filled in accordance with predefined instructions (para. # 0009, 0040-0043, 0048,0055,0066 figs. 2a, 3).

Regarding claim 15 Shaganti et al teaches wherein the instructions define the information that is to be inserted in the information entity in response to an event (para. # 0009, 0040-0043, 0048,0055,0066, figs. 2a, 3).

Regarding claim 16 Shaganti et al teaches wherein said information entity is transported by means of a standardized data entity (para. # 0009, 0040-0043, 0048,0055, figs. 2a, 3).

Regarding claim 20 Shaganti et al teaches wherein the user equipment communicates transaction information via an interface that is based on at least one of the following: short message service (SMS); wireless application protocol (WAP); internet protocol (IP); a short range radio link; a proximity card type interface; an infrared link (para. # 0009, 0040-0043, 0048,0055, figs. 2a, 3).

Regarding claim 21 Shaganti et al teaches wherein the user equipment receives the information entity via a first type of interface and returns the information entity via a second type of interface (para. # 0009, 0040-0043, 0048,0055, figs. 2a, 3).

Regarding claim 22 Shaganti et al teaches wherein the user equipment communicates with a base station (inherent) of a cellular communication network (para. # 0009, 0040-0043, 0048, 0055, figs. 2a, 3, WAP enabled device, 0023).

Regarding claim 23 Shaganti et al teaches a user equipment comprising (figs. 1-3): processing means for insertion transaction information available for the processing means in at least one data field of an information entity that associates with an electronic transaction; and transmitter means for transmitting the information entity from the user equipment to a co-operative device over a wireless interface (para. # 0009, 0040-0043, 0048,0051, 0055, figs. 2a, 3, WAP enabled device, 0023).

Regarding claim 24 Shaganti et al teaches comprising storage means for storing the transaction information, wherein the processing means are adapted to fetch information from said storage means and to insert said information from the storage means into the information entity (para. # 0009, 0040-0043, 0048, 0055, figs. 2a, 3, WAP enabled device, 0023).

Regarding claim 25 Shaganti et al teaches wherein the processing means are adapted to obtain information from at least one other information entity and to insert said information from the at least one other information entity into said information entity that is the subject of the information insertion procedure (para. # 0009, 0040-0043, 0048, 0055, figs. 2a, 3, WAP enabled device, 0023).

Art Unit: 2686

Regarding claim 26 Shaganti et al teaches comprising authorization means arranged to authorize said insertion of information (para. # 0009, 0040-0043, 0048, 0055, figs. 2a, 3, WAP enabled device, 0023).

Regarding claim 27 Shaganti et al teaches a transaction system comprising (figs. 1-3):

a user equipment adapted to exchange transaction information with another party of a transaction (para. # 0009, 0040-0043, 0048, 0055, figs. 2a, 3); storage means for storing information (para. # 0009, 0040-0043, 0048, 0055, figs. 2a, 3); processing means for fetching information from the storage means and inserting the information into at least one data field of a data entity associated with said transaction (para. # 0009, 0040-0043, 0048, 0051, 0055, figs. 2a, 3); and communication means for transmitting the data entity from the user equipment to a co-operative device over a wireless interface (para. # 0009, 0040-0043, 0048, 0055, figs. 2a, 3, WAP enabled device, 0023).

Regarding claim 28 Shaganti et al teaches wherein the processing means are provided at the user equipment (para. # 0009, 0040-0043, 0048, 0055, figs. 2a, 3, WAP enabled device, 0023).

Regarding claim 29 Shaganti et al teaches wherein the processing means are provided at the co-operative device (para. # 0009, 0040-0043, 0048, 0055, figs. 2a, 3, WAP enabled device, 0023).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaganti (20050065950) and further in view of Weller et al (20030212642).

6. Regarding claims 17-19 Shaganti does not specifically teach data entity is based on the Electronic Commerce Modeling Language.

In an analogous art, Weller et al teaches data entity is based on the Electronic Commerce Modeling Language (para. # 0044, 0105). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Shaganti et al by specifically adding feature Electronic Commerce Modeling Language in order to enhance system performance Improves interoperability between the system users using minimal resources and is easily implemented to verify card holders identity as taught by Weller et al.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 7-25-05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Examiner has thoroughly reviewed applicant's arguments but firmly believes the cited reference to reasonably and properly meets the claimed limitations. Applicants argument was that "in response to a predetermined event, automatically inserting of transaction information in at least one data field of an information entity". In



Art Unit: 2686

response, examiner would like to point out that Shaganti states the requester 105 can be the same as the user 103, such as in case the user 103 wishes to store information for himself, e.g., personal or business phone numbers, E-mail addresses, and other similar information typically stored in a person's wallet, frequent flier numbers, passwords to debit cards, preferences and the like. In this case, an authorization is not required for the user 103 to view information objects stored by him (para. # 0055 and 0066). The user 103 provides his identifier and a secure password, to a requester 105. This could be done, for example, when the user 103 decides to provide a travel agent or a tailor that his personal travel preferences or style and measurements can be obtained from the server computer 100 operated by the PIRSP. In one embodiment, the requester's web page (not shown) comprises an area, selecting which the user 103 can specify that his information can be obtained from the PIRSP's web site. Preferably, the user 103 provides his identifier, a specific authorization--for example to fetch the travel preferences or the medical history and nothing else--and requests the requester 105 to obtain his personal information from the PIRSP. The requester computer 106 is configured to receive this authorization over a secure channel, and to initiate a request to the PIRSP for the user's personal information (para. # 0051). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad interpreted by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued,

will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969).

### ***Conclusion***

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Khawar Iqbal whose telephone number is (571) 272-7909.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Marsha D. Banks-Harold can be reached on (571) 272-7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

Art Unit: 2686

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

*Khawar Iqbal*

*icusha © Bank-Hawel*  
MARSHA D. BANKS-HAWEL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT  
TECHNOLOGY CENT.